

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 24, 2005, rejected all pending claims. The rejection is deemed to be overcome by this amendment and the arguments included herewith.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the electronic information is disclosed visually and/or audibly as part of the patient interaction capability of the method. This selectivity is not found in the references of record.

The references cited, such as Bain, are publications (not issued patents) and which are submitted to be inappropriate references under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, thus, also not available under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In this regard, see, *In re Carlson*, 25 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1207, 1211 (Fed. Cir. 1992).


Further, the rejection is submitted to be not in accord with the specific findings test established by the CAFC in *KSR International v. Teleflex, Inc.* with regard to the "teaching-suggestion-motivation" test. It is asserted in applicant's behalf that the cited Publications purport to disclose systems which are complete and satisfactory and that no suggestion is contained within the four corners of those documents that a further improvement or invention, such as the one made by applicant, is required.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter and a notice of allowance is requested. Should questions remain after consideration of the foregoing, the Office is kindly requested to contact the applicant's attorney at the address or telephone number given herein.

Serial No. 10/602,138

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William S. Britt', with a stylized flourish at the end.

William S. Britt

Registration No. 20,969

Attorney for Applicant

TRASKBRITT, PC

P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 23, 2005

WSB/bv

Document in ProLaw